

Attorney's Docket: 2002JP302  
Serial No.: 10/506,874  
Response to Final Rejection mailed 03/23/2007

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 23, 2007 has been carefully considered together with each of the references cited therein. The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration of the present Application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended the application to attend to housekeeping and to protect what Applicant believes to be the invention. In the claims, claims 1 and 7 were amended to more clearly recite that the weight percentages recited in the claims related to the undiluted solution and not the resulting film. Support for the amendment to claims 1 and 7 may be found in originally filed claims 1 and 7, and in Applicant's Specification on pages 9 (paragraph number [7]) and the paragraph on page 9, beginning 14 lines from the bottom of the page and continuing on to page 10, and more specifically on page 10, items numbered 2 to 5 which clearly recite that weight percentages of the claimed elements of the solution, and on page 19, lines 5-12, and example 1 on page 30, and 2-4 on pages 31-33, wherein all weight percentages are clearly recited in terms of the aqueous solution and not the film. It is believed that no new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The rejection of claims 1 and 7 as amended under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention should be withdrawn in view of the above amendments which more clearly recite that the weight percentages recited in the claim refer to the solution and not the cured film. Anyone skilled in the art in view of the specification (as noted above) and the language of claim 1 which recite would clearly understand that the weight percentages recited relate to "undiluted solution" which would permit anyone skilled in the art to determine the metes and bounds of the invention. Claims 7 was similarly amended to more clearly recite that the weight percentages relate to the undiluted solution. The rejection of claims 2-7 and 9-17 under 35

Attorney's Docket: 2002IP302Serial No.: 10/506,874Response to Final Rejection mailed 03/23/2007

USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention should be withdrawn for the reasons given in support of claim 1 and in view of the above amendments which more clearly recite that which the Applicant regards as the invention.

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the above remarks, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn and that this application is in a condition for an allowance of all pending claims. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and an allowance of all pending claims are courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Silverman, Agent for  
Applicant Registration No. 36,277

**(CUSTOMER NUMBER 25,255)**

CLARIANT CORPORATION  
INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
4000 Monroe Road  
Charlotte, NC 28205  
Phone (704) 331-7156  
Fax (704) 331-7707